

REMARKS

Claims 167-206 remain in this application and now stand Finally Rejected. To place the application in better condition for consideration, applicants have amended claims 167, 179, 205, and 206 both to remove the claim objections and to better distinguish applicants' invention over the art of record. Ample antecedent basis exists in the application for the amendments to the submitted claims so applicants have added no previously presented matter.

Before addressing the rejections, applicants will summarize their invention to assist the examiner in better appreciating the differences between pending claims and the art of record. As recited in newly amended submitted claim 167, applicants have provided a method of controlling at least one camera to separately capture the image of each of *a plurality of different objects in a common area by controlling the field of view of the at least one camera responsive to a command from a corresponding one of a plurality of users, each associated with an object*. To accomplish this task, an automatic control system remembers a field of view *for the at least one camera* associated with each object. When a user issues a command to capture the image of an associated object, the system identifies the user. Further, the system controls the field of view of the at least one camera in accordance with field of view remembered for the object associated with the user identified as entering the command.

35 U.S.C. 102(e) Rejection of Claims 167, 181, 205, and 206

Claims 167, 181, 205, and 206 stand Finally Rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,917,543, issued June 29, 1999, from an application filed May 1, 1996, in the name of Tsukasa Uehara. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the amendments to claims 167, 181, and 205

Applicants independent claim 167, as now amended, recites the feature that the at least one camera captures the image of each of a plurality of different objects in a common area. Further the claim recites the feature of remembering the field of view of each object within the field of view of the one camera. The Uehara patent does not disclose these features. The videoconference system in Uehara utilizes a pair of cameras (10, 12) at each conference site. However, Uehara does not control the field of view of either camera to capture the image of *each of a plurality of different objects in a common area*. **In other words, neither of Uehara's cameras captures each of a plurality of objects within its field of view. Further,**

the Uehara control system does not remember the field of view of each such object captured by each camera.

At best, the cameras (10a and 10b) at the conference sites "a" and "b" of Uehara capture the image of the operator at that respective site, while the cameras (12a and 12b) at each site capture the image of an original document. Neither of the cameras 10a and 10b nor 12a and 12b separately captures of multiple objects in a common area. Accordingly, the control system (32) of Uehara situated at each remote site does not remember the field of view of each of *a plurality of objects* captured by the one camera as recited in applicants' amended claim 167, because Uehara's cameras do not capture the image of more than one object.

Moreover, the Uehara videoconference system does not disclose or suggest multiple users associated with separate objects all within the field of view of the at least one camera as recited in claim 167. At best, Uehara contemplates a single operator at each videoconference site for controlling a camera to image a single object. Uehara has no need to identify a particular one of a plurality of users in order to obtain the particular camera field of view remembered for the object associated with the user who has entered a command to image that object. Each of Uehara's cameras captures only a single a single object associated with a single user. Thus, Uehara has no need to associate each of multiple objects with corresponding individual users. For this reason, applicants' claim 167 and the claims that depend therefrom patentably distinguish over the Uehara patent. Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

Applicants' claim 181 and the claims that depend therefrom likewise patentably distinguish over the Uehara patent for much the same reasons as advanced for claim 167. Claim 181 recites the feature that both of at least a first and second cameras are moveable so each can capture the image of at least first and second objects. Claim 181 also recites the feature of remembering the field of view of each of objects captured by each camera and associating each field of view with a corresponding user. As discussed, neither of Uehara's cameras captures multiple objects within its field of view, nor does the Uehara control system remember the field of view of each of such multiple objects captured by each camera. Further, Uehara does not associate each of multiple objects with corresponding individual users. For these reasons, claims 181, and the claims that depend therefrom patentably distinguish over the Uehara patent. Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim 205, and claim 206 which depends therefrom, likewise patentably distinguish over the Uehara patent for the same reasons as claim 181. Like claim 181, claim 205 and 206 both recite the feature that the first and second cameras each capture at least first and second

objects. Further, claim 205 also recites the feature of automatic control means for adjusting variables of the field of view associated with the first and second objects captured by the first and second said cameras. Neither of Uehara's cameras captures multiple objects, nor does the Uehara control system remember the field of view of each of such multiple objects captured by each camera. Further, Uehara does not associate each of multiple objects with corresponding individual users. For these reasons, claims 205 and 206 patentably distinguish over the Uehara patent. Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejection of Claims 168-180, 182-190 and 193-204

Claims 168-180, 182-190 and 193-204 stand Finally Rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the Uehara patent, in view of U.S. Patent 5,471,296, issued in the name of Jeffrey L. Parker et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection in view of the amendments to claims 167, 181 and 205.

Applicants have discussed the Uehara patent above with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) claim rejection and will not repeat that discussion here. For purposes of the instant rejection, applicants reiterate that the Uehara et al. patent does not teach the feature of remembering the field of view of each of *a plurality of objects*. Further, the Uehara patent does not teach applicants' feature of identifying a particular one of a plurality of users in order to obtain the particular camera field of view remembered for the object associated with the user who has entered a command to image that object.

The Parker et al. patent concerns a television lens control system that allows for control of various functions of a television camera lens, such as control of the iris, focus and zoom parameters, in conjunction with automatic tracking of an object. A control circuit can remember different fields of view for selection.

In rejecting claims 168-180, 182-190 and 193-204, the examiner contends that the Uehara patent teaches a two-camera system under control of an operator, but fails to teach issuing commands to remember the field of view. To overcome this deficiency, the examiner cites the Parker et al. patent for teaching an automatic control system under control of a user for remembering different field of views. However, like the Uehara patent, the Parker et al. patent contains no disclosure regarding identifying a particular one of a plurality of users who issued a command in order to obtain the particular camera field of view remembered for the object associated with the user who has entered a command to image the object, as recited in applicants' claims 167, 181 and 205. At best, the Parker et al. patent deals with a single user,

and would not suggest the need to discriminate among multiple users. For this reason, the combination of Uehara and Parker et al. would not render obvious applicants' claims 168-180, 182-190 and 193-204. Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejection of Claims 191 and 192

Claims 191 and 192 stand Finally Rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the Uehara patent, in view of the Parker et al. patent, further in view of U.S. Patent 5,818,513, issued October 6, 1998, from an application filed May 17, 1994, in the name of Soichi Sano et al. Claims 191 and 192 ultimately depend from claim 181 and incorporate by reference all of the features of their parent claim. Thus, claims 191-192 incorporate by reference the features of (a) identifying which user issued a command, (b) changing the field of view position of one of the cameras to a remembered field of view for the object associated with the user that issued the command; (c) remembering the control device that issued the command. As discussed previously, neither the Uehara and Parker et al. patents, nor their combination, disclose or suggest identifying each of multiple users in a video conference system to enable retrieval of a previously stored field of view for an object associated with that user.

At best, the Sano et al. patent discloses a multi-site video conferencing system includes a conference control unit that manages connections to each of a plurality of terminals using connection data to achieve a linkage to the terminals via a single call. There is no suggestion or disclosure in the Sano patent regarding identifying the users to enable retrieval of a previously stored field of view for an object associated with that user. Thus, combining the Sano et al. patent with the Uehara and Parker et al. patents would not yield the features recited in claim 181, and by implication, the features recited in claims 187-191. Accordingly, claims 187-191 patentably distinguish over the art of record. Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and accompanying remarks, applicants respectfully solicit favorable consideration of the claims. If the Examiner believes that such action cannot be taken, she is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6820 to arrange for a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview.

If any fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account **07-0832**.

Respectfully submitted,
Jeffrey L. Parker et al.



By: Robert B. Levy
Reg. No. 28,234
Phone (609) 734-6820

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, Previously presented Jersey 08543-5312
March 2, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop AF, Commissioner of Patents, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on the date listed below

Date

3-3-05

Lori Klewin